

Senate Council
December 5, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session on Monday, December 5, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

In Chair Swanson's absence, Vice Chair Robert Grossman called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 2:59 pm.

1. Minutes from November 28, 2011 and Announcements

There being no objection, the minutes from November 28, 2011 were **approved by unanimous consent**.

Due to invited guests present, the Vice Chair moved to agenda item number six. Those present introduced themselves.

6. Intellectual Property and Distance Learning

The Vice Chair introduced Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), who explained his concerns about UK's lack of clear policies regarding intellectual property and distance learning curricula. UK has conflicting policies regarding intellectual property, specifically regarding a faculty member's rights to ownership of the distance learning curriculum, etc. created by the faculty member.

After brief discussion, there was a general consensus that there is no clear definition regarding a faculty member's intellectual property rights at UK for distance learning courses. Provost's Liaison Greissman suggested he pursue the issue with Provost Subbaswamy, and there were no objections. The Vice Chair noted that any new policy would need to be discussed with SC. He thanked Brown for bringing the issue to the SC's attention.

1. Minutes from November 28, 2011 and Announcements

Moving to announcements, the Vice Chair asked Blonder for an update on the Web Advisory Committee, which she gave. He then reported that the Chair was working with the President on a process to make a short list of faculty, from which the President will choose a faculty member to serve as the Faculty Athletics Representative. Lastly, McCormick will serve as the Senate's representative on the search committee for the director of the Honors Program.

2. Old Business

b. Establishment of Senate Committee to Serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program

SC members discussed the size, diversity and composition of the Senate Committee to Serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program.

McCormick **moved** that the Honors Program will have the Senate Committee to Serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program, appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, which acts as the faculty of record for all Honors curriculum. This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty representing each of the undergraduate colleges; the Committee will report to the Director of Honors, to whom they shall transmit their recommendations, for consideration by the Undergraduate Council. The Vice Chair clarified that the motion superseded the SC motion from the previous week. Wood **seconded**.

Wood **moved to amend the motion** to change the language to “This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty broadly representative of each of the undergraduate colleges...” There was discussion about the amendment. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the **amendment** passed with none opposed.

The Vice Chair clarified that the Senate Committee to Serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program will be responsible for very quickly reviewing and possibly taking action on the proposal created by the Honors Program Review Committee, which was under the auspices of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Honors Program will have the Senate Committee to Serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program, appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, which acts as the faculty of record for all Honors curriculum. This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty broadly representative of the undergraduate colleges; the Committee will report to the Director of Honors, to whom they shall transmit their recommendations, for consideration by the Undergraduate Council. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Andrew Hippisley, Chair

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in International Education

Guest Andrew Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee, explained the SAPC's charge, as well as the details of the proposal. He noted that there was a motion from the SAPC to send the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in International Education to the Senate with a positive recommendation.

There were a wide variety of questions from SC members, all of which were answered satisfactorily. Guest Beth Goldstein (ED/Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation) agreed to two suggestions – the proposal will no longer include “and visiting students” and the header “Admissions Process” will be moved to the paragraph immediately preceding it.

When there were no additional questions, Goldstein said she would send a revised proposal. The Vice Chair thanked her and she and Hippisley departed.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Raphael Finkel, Chair

ii. (Nursing) Proposal to Change *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2* (Allow 90 Hours of Transfer Credit for Students in the RN-BSN Program)

Guest Raphael Finkel, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) explained the proposal. Guests Pat Burkhart (NU) and Regina Lowry (NU) offered additional comments, including additional information about the rationale for the proposed change.

SC members asked a variety of questions about the proposal, including benchmark practices, the number of transfer hours that RN-BSN students typically bring, and the unique nature of the RN-BSN program. Those present were unaware of any other bachelor's degree program on campus that catered to students with an associate degree who are licensed, practicing professionals.

There was lengthy discussion about the proposal, after which the Vice Chair thanked the guests and they departed.

b. i. Proposal for Formalized High School/University Dual Credit

Finkel explained the basics of the proposal with assistance from Associate Provost Mike Mullen, who was present to answer questions about the proposal. SC members asked a lot of questions about the proposal. There was particular concern over the ability of a department to have control over the choice of instructor of record for a dual credit course, as well as the difference between a student taking a dual credit course versus an Advanced Placement (AP) exam. There was extensive discussion among SC members, Finkel and Mullen.

After discussion wound down, Guest Mullen suggested that the proposal be revised to include a new section of the *Senate Rules* (including draft rules language) to codify the various aspects of the program. The Vice Chair thanked Mullen and he departed.

a. i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in International Education

The Vice Chair noted that there was a **motion** from the SAPC to recommend approval by the Senate of the proposed new Graduate Certificate in International Education, with the agreed upon revisions. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. ii. (Nursing) Proposal to Change *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2* (Allow 90 Hours of Transfer Credit for Students in the RN-BSN Program)

There was additional, brief discussion. Blonder **moved** to send the proposal to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) and Wood **seconded**. After additional discussion regarding the entities that had (and had not) reviewed the proposal, Wood **moved** to table the proposal until the Health Care Colleges Council and the Undergraduate Council had a chance to review the proposal.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to table the proposal until the Health Care Colleges Council and the Undergraduate Council had a chance to review the proposal and the motion **passed** with none opposed. It was made clear that the proposal should be sent to both councils simultaneously for parallel review.

b. i. Proposal for Formalized High School/University Dual Credit

SC members discussed the proposal; there were a variety of concerns mentioned, foremost being a possible watering down of the high-school taught course and the overlap with AP testing. After additional discussion, the Vice Chair opined that the general consensus was that the proposal be tabled until Senate Rules-type language is drafted and presented to the SC.

5. Academic Calendars

Steiner **moved** to accept all calendars by acclamation. (2012 - 2013 Calendar; 2014 - 2015 Calendar, Tentative; 2012-2013 Dentistry; 2014 - 2015 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2012 Law; Spring 2013 Law; Summer I (four-week) 2013 Law; Summer 2013 Law; Fall 2014 Law, Tentative; Spring 2015 Law, Tentative; Summer I (four-week) 2015 Law, Tentative; Summer 2015 Law, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Medicine; 2014 - 2015 Medicine, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Pharmacy; 2014 - 2015 Pharmacy, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Winter Intersession; and 2014 - 2015 Winter Intersession, Tentative.) There being no objection, the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Mrs. Brothers noted that this was the first time the College of Pharmacy took advantage of their longstanding but never utilized approval for an alternate calendar. The Vice Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to highlight the Pharmacy calendars to the Pharmacy senators to ensure they are accurate.

7. Tentative Senate Agenda for December 12, 2011

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda. Two items were removed, and a few items were reordered. There were no objections to the tentative Senate agenda, as amended.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,
Senate Council Vice Chair

SC members in attendance: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Pienkowski, Steiner, Wasilkowski, Wimberly and Wood.

Provost's Liaison Present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Roger Brown, Raphael Finkel, Beth Goldstein, and Mike Mullen.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, December 16, 2011.